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Abstract: Middle Bronze Age Hungary provides an opportunity to investigate prehistoric ‘landscapes of the body’, as perceptions and attitudes to the body affect burial practices and other body practices, including the wearing of dress and the use of pottery. This article explores the cultural diversity expressed by the roughly contemporary and neighbouring groups of the Encrusted Ware, Vatya, and Füzesabony Cultures. Amongst others, differences between the three groups are articulated through their burials (scattered cremations, urn burials as well as crouched inhumations) and the diverse use of material culture. At the same time, despite formal differences in the burials, the analysis shows that cremations and inhumations in this area share a number of characteristics, and it is the other practices through which the dead body is manipulated that are the primary means of expressing regional differences. Simultaneously, whilst being a means of formulating understandings of the deceased body, burial practices are also tied into subtle differences in lifestyles, daily routines and regional subsistence strategies, as the landscapes of the living provide metaphors, know-how and practical understanding.
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INTRODUCTION

Differences in burial practices provide critical opportunities for investigating prehistoric perceptions and attitudes to the body, aspects that would otherwise be extremely difficult to ascertain, but which are at the same time central to the workings of these societies. Within the larger project of investigating the changing attitudes to the body expressed in the widespread use and adoption of cremation during the Middle and Late Bronze Age,¹ the cultural diversity within central Hungary constitutes an important case study.² Central Europe, and in particular the Carpathian Basin, has often been claimed as the origin of the Urnfield Culture with its practice of cremation (Gedl 1991; Pfannenschmidt 2000), but the diversity of burial traditions within this area brings into doubt the idea that cremation, as a
new practice, has a single and simple point of origin. Furthermore, the variability of burial practices also undermines the expectation that the transition from inhumation to cremation will be linear and follow a certain prescribed trajectory; the variations are too many to be summarized in terms of simple shared developments. The aim of this case study is, therefore, to investigate the contemporaneous existence of groups practising different forms of burial rites in this particular part of central Europe, and to analyse how these are linked to differences in lifestyles as well as attitudes to the body.

**SETTING: THE WORLD OF THE LIVING**

The archaeological landscape of Bronze Age Hungary (Fig. 1) can be described as fragmented – composed of groups that differ not only in their material culture (particularly their pottery), but also in settlement and subsistence patterns. The differences between groups have long been recognized and perhaps at times slightly over-interpreted in terms of the movement of peoples. In response to the complex setting suggested by existing work, this article uses a different approach. By taking the human body as the reference point for investigation it aims to understand the diverse practices that gave rise to these groupings. We will contrast three major contemporary Middle Bronze Age cultures: Encrusted Ware, Vatya, and Füzesabony. The groups have been chosen for their close geographical proximities to each other and their distinct characteristics regarding burial rituals: in the Encrusted Ware Culture scattered cremations predominate; in the Vatya Culture...
urn burials are used; and in Füzesabony inhumation is the most common grave form. The spatial proximity of the groups as well as a presumed dense population make it very likely that people of these different groups knew of each other and routinely interacted. This means that the differences in burial practices should not be taken for granted, but rather seen as deliberately maintained and probably involved in the construction and maintenance of distinct identities.

The geographical setting of all three cultures is the Carpathian Basin of central Europe, with its important river valleys of the Danube and the Tisza (Fig. 2). The Encrusted Ware Culture is found in the hilly regions of the western part of Hungary – Transdanubia – an area divided into a northern and southern part by Lake Balaton. Its distribution, primarily defined by its elaborate pottery tradition, stretches from the Danube all the way to the Drava, around the Balaton and the Sió. The Great Hungarian Plain, a terrain ranging from flat to rolling plains, is the main setting for the Vatya Culture, which is situated on both sides of the Danube in a densely settled and therefore well-researched area. The origins of the Vatya Culture are thought to be connected to the late Kisapostag settlements in north-east Transdanubia (Bóna 1975:32), from where it quickly spread southwards and across the Danube, until it covered an area reaching from the Danube bend to the Mohács island and from the low plain of the Fejér-megye to the middle of the Danube-Tisza interfluves (Bóna 1975:28). In the later phase, the distribution of Vatya finds reached the Tisza and the interfluves south of the Danube-Tisza. This area provided excellent grazing land and the banks of the Danube were the preferred settlement locations. The landscape of the north-eastern part of Hungary and south-east Slovakia, the setting for the Füzesabony Culture, is again quite different. The highest mountains of Hungary are found here in the foothills of the Carpathians along the Slovakian border. In the early stages of the Füzesabony Culture, the valley of the river Hernád, north of the Tisza-Bodrog confluence, seems to be an important centre. Later, the Füzesabony Culture expanded south along the Tisza to the Körös, remaining mainly on the left bank of the Tisza. In Middle Bronze Age II, the Füzesabony Culture almost reached the Danube near Budapest and became a neighbour of the Vatya Culture (Bóna 1975:146). To summarize, the distribution of each of the three cultures changes through time. They expand to different degrees and their areas shift. Sites that saw continuous use through the Middle Bronze Age may therefore show changes in their repertoire of cultural practices, raising questions about the reasons for these changes – were they due to new cultural influences, to movements of people, or to gradual cultural changes? The important point to note here is that whereas there is a strong suggestion of shifts and movements of boundaries, there is also maintenance of difference, expressed through distinct attitudes to the body.

Each of the three cultures developed from pre-existing Early Bronze Age groups through consolidation and expansion into new territories. There is therefore a strong sense of continuity between the Early and the Middle Bronze Age cultures in this area. Encrusted Ware was preceded by Gáta (Wieselburg) and Kisapostag, Vatya is seen as the more or less direct successor of Nagyrév (Bándi 1966: 21–25,
Kovács 1984: 218) with possible Kisapostag influences (dramatized by Bóna as an invasion and fusion story; Bóna 1975:31–32). Füzesabony probably developed as a successor to the Koštany Culture with influences from Hatvan and Otomani. Recently the dates of the Bronze Age have generally been moved back, due to the implementation of calibrated $^{14}$C dates and dendrochronology in central Europe. Cultural-historical approaches using typological comparisons suggested a timeframe between 1670 and 1350 BC including the later phases (Bóna 1992:40–41), but the new Bronze Age chronologies set a timeframe between 1900 and 1600 BC for the Middle Bronze Age (Kristiansen and Larsson 2005:118). There are still rather few $^{14}$C dates available from the sites we discuss or contemporary ones, but the majority of $^{14}$C dates range between about 2000 and 1500 BC (Forenbaher 1993:236), with calibrated $^{14}$C dates suggesting 2450 to 2050 BC for Nagyrév, and 1959 to 1650 BC for Vatya, excluding the latest phase (Kalicz-Schreiber 1995:83; after Raczky et al. 1992:42–47). Early graves from Megyaszó, a cemetery of the Füzesabony Culture, are thought to date around 2100 cal BC (Schalk 1994:169). The total duration of the Middle Bronze Age, the period focused on here, differs regionally and is still somewhat unclear, but it probably lasted for around 300 years from 1950 cal BC. The end of the Middle Bronze Age seems to be characterized by more dramatic changes and greater rupture than the beginning. These changes are associated with the fusion between local and various foreign elements, including disruptive influences from the central European Tumulus Culture, a period labelled archaeologically as the ‘Koszider Horizon’.

Figure 2. Distribution of the Encrusted Ware, Vatya and Füzesabony Cultures.
Encrusted Ware

Before proceeding to our main focus of interest, it is important to appreciate the differences in settlement patterns as well as in associated subsistence and economic strategies between the three cultures. The daily-life contexts, in which people formulate their understanding of the body and death, were different and have to be brought into an analysis of burial practices. For the Encrusted Ware Culture, the majority of sites suggest impermanent and transient settlements, which has led to the interpretation that it was a nomadic society (Bóna 1992:24). The most common settlement form is the single layer site, consisting of rectangular houses. In addition, small, fortified hilltop settlements (for example Harc-Várhegy or Simontornyá-Mozsihegy) are known in the southern part of the area (Bóna 1975:198); these have been interpreted as places of refuge (Bóna 1992:24). Recent excavations do, however, seem to challenge this picture. In Kaposvár-Toponár for example, a 400 m-long village with structures such as storage pits and wells was revealed (Kiss 2003:150), architecturally similar to tells. Some settlements show evidence for local bronze casting (e.g. Kölesd-Csonthegy or Alsónyék-Szőlőskert; Bóna 1975:197, 222), but pottery production might have been one of the most important craft activities. It is not only present in the domestic context, but also used in funerary rituals and even used as a building material in the construction of graves. The decorated pottery is indeed very elaborate, evenly fired and of high quality; incised patterns are highlighted in white paste and cover most of the surface of jugs, cups and urns (Kiss 2003:150). The presence of a series of similar pottery hints at production in workshops (Bóna 1975:222), and Encrusted Ware is exported to areas to the east and west, where small cups and bowls are found in most major sites including tells. Pottery exported from the Encrusted Ware Culture can also be found in graves, for example at the cemetery of Dunaújváros-Dunadúló, where 26 burials out of 611 graves of the Vatya Culture included Encrusted Ware pottery in the grave assemblage (Vicze 2001:37, 215).

The evidence for the subsistence practices of the Encrusted Ware Culture is particularly important for characterizing the nature of society and daily life. Although some of the subsistence practice was probably based on agriculture, most of the inhabited land is not ideal for growing crops and the settlements might have had to be abandoned when the fertility of the fields declined (Kiss 2003:148). The high numbers of animal bones and antlers shows that herding as well as hunting made important contributions to the diet. Cattle were common and their bones are found in graves. Horses, in contrast to what one might expect for a nomadic society, do not seem to have been much used (Bóna 1975:222). The new settlement evidence, together with the faunal evidence and the great quantity and quality of the pottery, and the emphasis placed upon it, suggests that the interpretation of the Encrusted Ware Culture as a mobile, nomadic society needs to be rethought. Whether or not the Encrusted Ware Culture had some of the characteristics of a nomadic society, pottery production, and possibly cattle rearing may also have had special importance and may therefore be an influence for the construction of burials.
Vatya

Vatya is a so-called ‘tell-culture’, which means that much of the population lived in densely occupied, confined and long-lived settlements. This suggests that people living on these sites might have had a different sense of history and belonging to a place, which would have been significant for how individuals identified with their immediate surroundings, and may therefore also be important for the construction of different aspects of identity. Generally favoured locations for the tells were on hilltops and river-banks that were well chosen and naturally safe (Bóna 1975:52). There was no break in the settlement tradition with the beginning of the Vatya Culture; early settlements (for example Dunaújváros-Kosziderpadlás or Százhalombatta) were already occupied during the Nagyrév phase, but became larger and gradually fortified in the latest Vatya phase. Dunaújváros-Kosziderpadlás, for example, a centre of the Vatya Culture, is situated on a loess bank on the right bank of the Danube and covers an oval area of 300 by 200 m, surrounded by creeks running into the Danube. The entrance is fortified by a rampart and streets are still visible in the landscape, and, in the centre, an ‘acropolis’ was found (Bóna 1975:58). The tells preserved details in evidence of domestic arrangements, showing how the dense settlement structures were maintained by rebuilding, repair, and other types of maintenance (Sørensen and Vicze forthcoming). Inside each house were one or more hearths, built of the same clay as the pottery (Søfaer pers. comm.). Large numbers of pits inside the houses are a feature peculiar to the Vatya Culture; they seem to have been open and in constant use during the ‘life’ of the house. The excavation at Százhalombatta has revealed examples of the lining of pits with straw, which confirms that they were storage pits, probably for food. The pits were a distinct architectural feature, uncommon in settlements of the other groups discussed here, and they would have affected people’s practical understanding of how to share, care and store within the bounds of the house. The architectural feature of pits might, therefore, be an obvious metaphor to draw upon in the construction of graves as a ‘storage place for the dead’.

The subsistence practices of the Vatya Culture were based on highly specialized farming and probably included some sites involved in the processing of secondary products such as wool. Recent research has shown a dramatic subsistence/economic change from the Early to the Middle Bronze Age, as a focus on sheep replaced the breeding of cattle for meat (Vretemark forthcoming). Hunting as well as fishing and shellfish collecting supplemented the diet. Environmental analyses conducted as part of the research on the Benta Valley, neighbouring the Százhalombatta tell, support the interpretation that pastoralism was highly important in the Middle Bronze Age, as large-scale agriculture had not taken place (French forthcoming). The location of the Vatya Culture along the Danube has been used to argue a role for trade, although there is scant evidence for the export of local bronze or pottery (Bóna 1975:73–75). Recent suggestions of the importance of wool production might therefore be an explanation for the position of these sites on obvious trade routes.

Füzesabony

Most of the settlement data for the Füzesabony Culture also comes from tell settlements (for example Jászdózsa-Kápolnahalom, Tőszeg-Laposhalom or Füzesabony-
Öregdomb). In this respect, Füzesabony does not differ much from Vatya. The Füzesabony tells are usually found on slight elevations, along the loess banks of the river Tisza and its tributaries. Many Füzesabony tells had already been used for centuries by Early Bronze Age groups, such as the Hatvan Culture. The houses, as seen for example at the eponymous site of Füzesabony-Öregdomb, were rectangular buildings averaging 4–6 m wide and 5–12 m long, arranged in a regular pattern, with pathways between the houses and open areas. Hearths were built into the clay house-floors (Szathmári 1992:134–145), but larger ovens are usually placed outside the buildings (Kovács 1984:236). Some tells were defended by elaborate ditches and ramparts as in Barca or Spišský Štvrtok, or by more complex structures such as stone walls (Vladár 1973). Bóna suggests that the settlement sites consisted of two parts; a densely structured core site and a more scattered village outside the fortification (Bóna 1975:146). Agriculture in the fertile river valleys in combination with the breeding of animals was the basis of subsistence and this is demonstrated by the presence of quern stones, grains, faunal remains and storage pits on tells. Bronze industry flourished and is well documented by finds of moulds from sites such as Tiszafüred, Tőszeg and Füzesabony, including several moulds for heart-shaped pendants and pins (Meier-Arendt 1992:198–199). In this region, a large quantity of decorative bronzes has been found as hoards and in graves; these bronzes include objects to decorate the person, such as pendants, small plates, and arm and leg spirals. The spiral dominates the shape of the objects themselves and they can be highly decorative, at the same time the surfaces of objects such as weapons are richly engraved with the same spiral motifs. This motif is mirrored in the pottery, which is of a high quality, well burnished and of elaborate shape. Some of the products were probably produced primarily as decorative elements for the households, for example bowls with elaborate plastic decorations on the outside and on the base that could be hung on the walls (Sofaer 2006:140). The role of the pottery in the graves will be discussed later.

Although the three groups were roughly contemporary, in close proximity and interacting with each other, there were subtle as well as more obvious differences between them in terms of the organization of subsistence and settlements, involving practices that had direct impact on people’s everyday lives and the ways they made (Fig. 3) and understood their material surroundings; these differences are the things traditions are made of. In the following we will explore the differences in burial practices, and consider whether and how associations are drawn between the different spheres of life and death in each of these areas and what this may imply in terms of understanding the body.

**Landscapes of the dead**

In contrast to many other parts of Europe, cremation is already found regularly in the Carpathian Basin by the time of the Makó and Bell Beaker groups (c. 2700 to 2400 cal BC; Visy 2003:486). Although cremation was clearly part of established burial practices, it is common to place the transition from inhumation to cremation later, and thus to focus on the change in preference rather than merely presence. During the Early Bronze Age, both inhumation and cremation were practised, but
rather than merging together to an overall dominance of one, both were transformed during the period, leading to new regional traditions. Although these traditions are well known, little attention has been given to the themes they have in common and in particular to whether there were shared ways of understanding the body despite the apparent distinction between inhumation and cremation.

Cremation and inhumation burials share a number of common characteristics. Addressing them merely as an opposing set of concepts therefore misses potentially important similarities in the wide range of practices involving the body. For example, the placing, orientation, and composition of objects as well as the body in graves 24 and 35 from Stredan nad Bodrogom (Füzesabony Culture) are almost identical (Fig. 4). Grave 35 is an inhumation with the body placed on the left side with the head to the west. The rectangular pit of grave 24 is oriented the same way, but it contained a cremation, which was similarly placed to the west of the pottery. In both cases the pottery was placed at the ‘feet’. In addition, the set of pottery was organized similarly in both graves, with a jug placed inside the bowl and a small cup, completing the set, placed with the body (Polla 1960:311, 314, 353). The two graves illustrate clearly how the treatment of the cremated body can be interchangeable with the non-cremated one; it is being displayed and cared for in the same manner and the bodies, despite their material differences, are the centre of attention in similar ways. The dividing line in this article is therefore not whether the body is cremated or not, but how the treatment of, and practices associated with, the dead body were carried out and result in radical different understandings of ‘proper burials’.

Cemetery size and structure
In terms of cemetery size and structure, the groups share several common characteristics. The cemeteries are usually separate from, but in the close vicinity of, the settlements, from a few hundred metres to a few kilometres away (Bóna 1975:59, 148, 199;
Csányi 2003:157, Vicze 2001:11). The size of the individual cemeteries usually ranges from 20 up to 200 graves, leaving the impression of small family units. In terms of size variability, however, Encrusted Ware Culture cemeteries with over 100 graves are rare (e.g. Ménfőcsanak, Mosonszentmiklós; Kiss 2003:151), but some cemeteries of the Vatya Culture (such as Dunaújváros-Dunadúlő) and the Füzesabony Culture (such as Tiszafüred) can be substantially bigger, with burials numbering into the thousands. The cemeteries are all flat cemeteries, with individual graves respecting each other despite a lack of obvious surface markers. None of the cultures has very clear spatial arrangements shared by all cemeteries, but in some Encrusted Ware Culture sites graves seemed to be aligned in rows, and in the early Vatya Culture 9–20 graves may be found in oval groups (Vicze 1992:92). Whenever such patterns are observed, they are interpreted as families or descent groups. In addition, the orientation of the rectangular grave pits of both the Encrusted Ware Culture and Füzesabony Culture is standardized; there is, however, no obvious element of orientation within Vatya cemeteries. In tune with the longevity of the tells, the cemeteries of the Vatya and Füzesabony Cultures often seem to have been in use for a long time, from the Early to the end of the Middle Bronze Age. The duration of cemetery use for the Encrusted Ware Culture is less certain. Although special constructions, such as cult houses, funerary platforms or death houses are known from some Bronze Age burial traditions (e.g. Lüneburg; Busch 1996; Pitten: Sørensen and Rebay 2005), very

Figure 4. Cremation grave 24 (left) and inhumation grave 35 (right) from Streda nad Bodrogom, Slovakia (Polla 1960:353).
little trace of such structures has been found in any of the three cultures compared here. It has, however, been suggested that remains of the funerary pyres have been found in some Vatya cemeteries (such as Izsák and Tököl-Csép; Bóna 1975:52). Thus, whereas there are some differences between the three cultures in the formal characteristics of cemeteries, these seem to be the result of the length of time the cemeteries were in use and the extent to which family structures were reflected in the layout. There is nothing in the layout of the cemeteries that is directly affected by whether the body was cremated or inhumed.

Attitudes to the body: Encrusted Ware

To investigate potential differences in the attitudes to the body, we therefore have to look at other details in order to trace where the differences begin. In the Encrusted Ware Culture, cremation is practised throughout the whole area, although small children could apparently be exempt, since their bodies were sometimes discovered in vessels, such as at Patince or Királyszenetistván (Bóna 1975:199). Usually, the body was cremated together with its dress fittings and ornaments, which are sometimes discovered among the pyre remains. In the 17 Encrusted Ware Culture cremations from the cemetery of Környe-Fácánkert the bones are large fragments, with an average of 240–250 pieces per individual. The average weight of the bones per cremation is 307 grams (c. 660g for males, c. 300g for females, and 70–80g for children; Bándi and Nemeskéri 1971:23). From observation of uneven burning of different anatomical parts, Bándi and Nemeskéri (1971:26) suggest that the body was placed on the pyre in a crouched position. This means the body was placed in the same way as it would be in the contemporary inhumation traditions. The remains are subsequently buried in oval to rectangular grave pits that are slightly smaller than body-size, but still larger than those needed for the interment of the cremation itself (on average 0.7 by 1.2 m and 0.6–0.7 m deep; Bóna 1975:199). In most cases, the remains are scattered over part of the surface of the pits and pottery is often used to outline or cover the body, as if it is defining its space. This covering of the body can be done extremely carefully; for instance, grave 82 from Vörs-Papkert (Kiss 2003:150) shows a careful arrangement of densely packed pots next to each other, and upside down. In some cases, such as the cemetery of Iža, human remains are placed in pits in anatomical order or show other arrangements such as heaps with the larger bones on the bottom and the smaller ones on top (Dušek 1969:35–49). The great care taken in protecting the bones and keeping a sense of integrity after they have been moved from the pyre, shown in the scattering over the pit base or ordering of the bones, and in the desire to cover and almost ‘shield’ the cremated bones from the soil that would fill the grave, suggest the remains of the body were seen both as meaningful entities and as vulnerable.

Scattered cremations are the exclusive burial form of the south Transdanubian group (Bándi 1984:270), but in the north of the Encrusted Ware Culture, contemporary urn burials are found (Bándi and Nemeskéri 1971:28). For example, at Mosonszentmiklós 38 of the 75 published graves were urn burials, 22 were scattered cremations, and in the rest no ‘ashes’ were found (Uzsoki 1963:86). In this
area it is common that not only the cremation, but also accessory vessels are found in the urns, as if the whole pottery assemblage is essential to constitute the essence of the grave – ‘in-urning’ the entire grave and not just the body. The Encrusted Ware Culture urns are the same types as the accompanying vessels in the scattered cremations, which led Bóna (1975:199) to conclude that the practice of urn burials must have developed in this area. The variation within the Encrusted Ware Culture suggests a local refinement in the understanding of how to respond to the ‘the needs’ of the cremated body, as the remains become even more protected through the use of urns.

Attitudes to the body: Vatya
The typical Vatya grave consists of hardly more than a round pit, between 0.6 and 1.2 m deep, and just wide enough for burying the Vatya urn. The deceased were cremated dressed and, since cremation places have not been found, it is assumed that individual pyres were used. Variable amounts of human bones were placed in the urns, leading Bóna (1975:41) to suggest that in some cases little care was taken while gathering the bones, or that gathering them all was not needed or desired. In some cemeteries, however, such as Dunaújváros-Dunadúlő (Vicze 2001), the bones were carefully gathered and arranged anatomically within the urn with the skull pieces on top. The anthropological analysis of Vatya urn burials from Szíjetszentmiklós-Felsőtag (Zoffmann 1995:173–175) confirms that only one individual was present per urn. The bodies were probably cremated at a temperature of about 800°C, which was estimated from the chalk-white colour of the bones with occasional brown and grey discolouring, as well as from the average size of the fragments. All anatomical regions of the body were cremated evenly, so that no conclusions could be drawn as to how the body was placed on the pyre. The average weight per cremation is 272 grams, with adults reaching an average of 343 grams. Although these numbers cannot verify whether all the human remains were gathered from the pyre, the weight is not unusual for cremations recovered on archaeological excavations (McKinley 2000). Not all the Vatya urns, however, actually contained cremations; in six out of 21 urns from the cemetery of Százhalombatta-Alsó Szőlők no bones were found (Poroszlai 1990:214). Urns were usually firmly closed with up to three bowls, and stone slabs were occasionally used as an additional cover (Bóna 1975:52; Poroszlai 1990:213). Vicze (1992:92) suggests that the urns might only have been half-buried, with the top of the neck and the stone cover standing out as grave markers. Inhumations are very rare, although the practice of cremation becomes interrupted more regularly towards the end of the Vatya Culture, when crouched inhumations appear more often among the urn burials (Kovács 1984:220). The emphasis of the Vatya burial practices is the secure closure of the urn. Rather than scattering and dispersing the remains, a motive we repeatedly encounter in the Encrusted Ware Culture cremations, the cremated bodies are contained and stored in a large vessel – a vessel that may refer to a storage vessel on a settlement. The grave pit itself may reference the storage pit, a structure typical of Vatya tells. We might conclude that this reference hints at a motive of storing the
dead as a means of remembrance, and that this was expressed through routine actions involving familiar materials.

**Attitudes to the body: Füzesabony**
The Füzesabony graves are an example of an inhumation tradition. The graves are usually rectangular or oval pits, the size of which varies with the size of the bodies. They are usually between 0.8 and 1.6 m long, although a few extraordinarily large graves (up to 3 m long) have been observed. Grave depths can vary substantially, and there seems to be a correlation between gender and grave depth as well as the amount of grave goods. Men are usually buried in the deepest graves, women in the next deepest, and children are buried in the shallowest graves (Bóna 1975:149). Most of the bodies are placed in a loosely crouched position facing east or south; the arms are usually bent, with the hands in front of the face. It is commonly proposed that the placing of the body on the left or right side was based on gender, although there is little anthropological analysis to support this interpretation for this period. This scheme, which was rigidly adhered to in the Copper Age (Chapman 1997:138) seems to become more flexible in the course of the Bronze Age, and cemeteries may vary considerably. For example, at the Early to Middle Bronze Age cemetery of Hernádka only 10 per cent of the bodies were placed on their right sides (Schalk 1992:36–37), whereas in the Middle Bronze Age cemetery of Megyaszó 52 per cent were on their left and 48 per cent on their right sides (Bóna 1975:150). In the Late Bronze Age cemetery of Mezőcsát gender-based differences in the orientation of bodies seem to have disappeared (Hänsel and Kalicz 1986).

The Füzesabony cemeteries suggest a certain degree of interference with the grave that is commonly labelled as ‘grave robbing’. This is in contrast to the lack of evidence for post-funeral activities in Encrusted Ware and Vatya cemeteries. It has been argued that the reopening of the graves happened some three generations after the funeral (Pástor 1969:82–83), which suggests that it is not part of the burial rite itself, but may still be within the time affected by collective memory about the deceased. It seems that up to half of the graves were disturbed on many cemeteries, such as Gelej (Kemenczei 1979:28) and Hernádka (Schalk 1992:84). At the same time, there is clearly some emphasis on individual characteristics of the body being buried in terms of gender and probably kinship. These are expressed through different aspects of the design of the burial, such as the depth and size of the pit and the orientation of the body. These are similar to practices found in many other Bronze Age communities (e.g. Franzhausen and Gemeinlebarn, Austria: Neugebauer 1991; Sprenger 1999). In the inhumation graves, no additional activities are carried out to confirm the corporeality of the body and to stress its boundaries.

Although inhumation graves predominate, a few cremations are found in most of the Füzesabony cemeteries. These are generally scattered cremations, urn graves are more uncommon. The highest proportion of cremation burials was found at the cemetery of Streda nad Bodrogom (Polla 1960), which had 34 cremations, 24 inhumations, and 9 ‘symbolic graves’. In the Tiszafüred-Majoroshalom cemetery, the size and shape of the pits used for cremation is at first based on the size of the body, as in
inhumation graves, but through time the pits become smaller and more irregular in
shape (Kovács 1984:239, 1992a:96). A remarkable feature of the Füzesabony cemeter-
ies is the presence of so-called ‘symbolic graves’ (e.g. Streda nad Bodrogom: 9; Gelej:
16). They are usually grave pits similar in size and orientation to the rest of the
graves, and they frequently contain pottery sets, but there are no traces of a body. It
is interesting here to recall the empty urns of the Vatya Culture mentioned earlier.
The term ‘symbolic grave’ used for such features implies that they are interpreted as
graves without bodies. Alternatively, these may be structures used during the
funeral or for post-funerary rituals.

**Comparison of attitudes to the body**

Comparison of these three contemporary, but very different responses to the
deceased body, shows both overlapping concerns and individual motivations. The
main focus of the Encrusted Ware Culture burials seems to be the reconstitution of
the remains as a corporeal body. This is accomplished through the scattering of the
cremated bones over the base of the pit and the confirmation of this space through
the layout of the pottery. There is also an idea of the ‘vulnerable body’, which has to
be protected by covering it with pottery. This idea of protection is shared by the
Vatya Culture burials, but in this case it is carried out in a different way. Protecting
the body is a matter of total enclosure; the cremation is contained in an urn and
closed by one or more bowls. The urn is used in a manner that gives the body new
boundaries, almost reconstituting the dead person’s skin through the walls of the
pottery. It is debated whether the Vatya urns might in some cases express the embod-
iment of individuals, but gender and age as basic elements of society are not obvi-
ously expressed through the burial rites in either the Vatya or the Encrusted Ware
 Cultures. In the Füzesabony Culture, however, we do see some of these dimensions
of identity expressed. The corporeality of the body is not questioned in the inhumation
gravestones, and its boundary does not have to be confirmed, nor are special treat-
ments required to protect it. In the Füzesabony Culture the body might be seen as
sleeping but also transitional, deliberately put into the ground for transformation.
The practice of reopening of the grave might mark the end of this transitional period.

**The dressed body**

The use of ornaments both on the living body and in the grave can provide further
indications of how the body is understood, as dress elements provide an important
means of articulating various qualities of the body, such as gender or regional
belonging. In the Encrusted Ware Culture, metalwork is mainly known from
hoards and rarely appears in graves. For example, only 10 per cent of the graves in
the cemetery of Mosonszentmiklós contain bronze objects. These are usually small
items attached to clothing and the body itself, such as spiral-tubes, small rings, and
pins (Primas 1977:18), and it seems questionable whether they form a deliberate
part of the burial ritual rather than being incidentally included due to their close
relationship with the body.
In the Vatya Culture, bronze objects are found in a slightly higher proportion of graves (c. 15–20%; Vicze 1992:93), although the percentage varies through time; gold is rare. Small dress fittings and pieces of jewellery, such as beads, are usually cremated with the body, whereas other objects, such as pins, bracelets, pendants and torques, are not included in the pyre but are deposited separately in the grave. Daggers are very rare, and other weapons and tools are almost nonexistent. The bronze objects are found both inside the urn as part of the cremation itself or as an added component, and outside the urn (Bóna 1975:44).

In the Füzesabony Culture, it is most common for graves to have only a few dress fittings and personal items. The percentage of graves with bronze objects and other small finds seems to decrease over time. In the early cemetery of Hernádkak more than 30 per cent of graves contain grave goods other than pottery. In the later cemeteries of Streda nad Bodrogrom and Gelej the percentage of bronze finds has decreased to 11 and 12 per cent respectively (Kemenczei 1979; Polla 1960; Schalk 1992). Some graves show clear differences between male and female assemblages. The male graves are equipped with bronze weapons such as spears, daggers and axeheads (e.g. Tiszafüred-Majoroshalom, grave B/54; Kovács 1992a:97); they are also frequently found with whetstones, and ornaments such as simple pins and necklaces of bronze spirals-tubes can complete the assemblage. In women’s graves more elaborate pins are found, and the necklaces often contain amber or glass beads as well as bronze spiral-tubes and pendants; arm and leg spirals complete the dress together with ornaments for the hair (Bóna 1975:150). A special type of needle-eyed pin is sometimes recovered from in front of the face. It has been proposed that it was used to sew a shroud together rather than being an element of the dress (Kovács 1992a:97). This pin is commonly found on its own, but may be added to a pair of pins (Schalk 1994:157). After the Middle Bronze Age, as exemplified by the cemetery of Mezőcsát (Hänsel and Kalicz 1986), there is an obvious increase in the inclusion of bronze ornaments in the graves; 26 of 40 graves contain bronze goods, and there is also a greater variation in those objects present, with both items designed for specific parts of the body (such as leg rings) and new types of dress attachments. At the same time, pottery decreases in quality and particularly in its ornamentation. Obviously, the appearance of the person was a major concern that continued in death; it seems that the surface for display of decoration and ornamentation shifts through time from the pottery to the body itself.

In comparison, a basic element of all three cultures is that some bronze objects are intimately linked to the body and are therefore predictably present in the graves regardless of whether the body was inhumed or cremated. In addition, there are also some distinct characteristics in the use of bronzes in the Vatya and the Füzesabony Cultures. In the former, there seems to be a distinction between objects that were cremated as part of the body, and other items that were added as regular grave gifts to the burial. In the latter, bronze objects are used in a way that suggests that males and females were associated with gendered material culture. The suggestion of shrouds in the Füzesabony Culture may be interpreted in different ways, but hints at a concern with the body itself that is otherwise not clearly expressed within this burial tradition.
THE ROLE OF POTTERY IN THE GRAVES

Encrusted Ware

Pottery shows a number of very pronounced differences in appearance as well as use in the three cultures. In the Encrusted Ware Culture most of the graves contain a large vessel with a double conical body and a large number of small vessels (on average between 60 and 120 mm high). The average number of pots per grave is 15 to 25, but occasionally up to 36 vessels, and rarely fewer than six. In addition, there is a great variety of types and most types come in different sizes. Graves may include duplications and multiplications of cups, goblets, bowls, jugs, large bi-conical vessels, unusual forms such as flat serving dishes on four feet, as well as cooking pots and storage vessels. The latter are often represented through large fragments rather than whole vessels. Amongst the vessels other ceramic objects may be found, such as bird statuettes, rattles and small bird-shaped vessels (Bóna 1975:213), as well as miniature vessels, which are sometimes associated with children’s graves (e.g. Mosonszentmiklós; Uzsoki 1963:88).

It seems that the whole available range of pottery is represented in the graves. Importantly, rather than appearing solely as grave goods, the pottery is used to outline the space of the grave. This is partly done by packing and stacking pots densely together over part of the surface and partly by lining pots along the side of the grave as exemplified by grave 36 from Királyszentistván (Fig. 5). The effect of this is that the pottery extends and gives shape to the burial, resulting in it appearing body-sized. This suggests that the pottery in the grave is not primarily aimed at fulfilling particular needs of the deceased in terms of a standard supply of drinks and food, nor is pottery used as a simple symbol linked to a particular identity. Rather it seems likely that the pottery is used to represent the household of the deceased or gifts from the mourning community in a broader sense, while it simultaneously confirms the presence of a body.

The importance of the pottery as part of the ritual performance of the burial is also suggested by evidence of the deliberate placing of pots (such as cups placed upside down directly upon the cremated bones in the Bonyhád cemetery; Csalog 1942:126) and pots being smashed and the fragments arranged over parts of the body (Veliačík 1972:218). It seems that some of the pottery may have been involved with the presentation of food or related to feasting or eating at the grave; this is supported by the presence of animal bones, in particular sheep and cattle (Uzsoki 1963:88), among the pottery. In the case of grave 22 in the cemetery of Királyszentistván, the bones were even found placed on a flat serving dish (Bóna 1975:Taf. 211).

Vatya

The use of pottery in Vatya burials is very different, with pots used both as containers for the cremation and as accessory vessels. The focus of the grave is the single large vessel containing the cremation; the form of the cremation vessels is the same as the ones found in domestic contexts. Analysis showed that at times these vessels were produced directly to be used as funerary urns; at other times they were reused domestic vessels (Budden 2007:260; Kreiter et al. 2004).
Large urns (340–400 mm; Vicze 2001:127) become more common in the course of the Middle Bronze Age, with some vessels measuring up to 0.9 m in height. The form of these vessels changes through time. In particular, they change from a soft, globular form to urns with a clear three-part division and a well-separated funnel neck; the widest place shifts from the lower third to the upper third of the body and the base becomes proportionally smaller. In addition, in the late phase the most common decoration changes from rough brushing and horizontal bands around the widest part of the body to more elaborate decoration, including grooves and encrusted patterns. Minor variation in the form and decoration on the urns may reflect individual preferences and access to the products of different potters (Budden 2007; Vicze 2001:227). These changes suggest an increased emphasis on the top of the urn, the part which would be visible after the urn is put into the burial pit. Furthermore the increased articulation of the different parts of the pot creates more obvious references to the divisions of the human body. This point is further emphasized by depictions of body parts and/or bronze objects on the top half of a few vessels (Fig. 6). For example, a vessel with an arm with a dagger from the cemetery of Dunaújváros, a vessel with two breasts and two arms with arm rings from the settlement of Százhalombatta, and a vessel with two eyes at the rim and two bent arms and a dagger below the elbow from the settlement at Mende-Leányvár (Kovács 1973:9, 1992b:80; Poroszlai 1992:155). These examples underline the analogy between large vessels and the human body made during this period in various contexts (Szeverényi 2007). These links are important because the urn itself literally embodies the fragmented body and the association between bodies and pots seems to be expressed on many levels.
Most of the urns were covered by bowls placed over the mouth of the urn; in the later phases additional bowls are added, creating layers of cover (Bóna 1975:59). Further closure may be created through an added stone-packing over the bowls. One or two additional small vessels, such as cups and jugs, as well as any other grave goods, are frequently found inside the urn on top of the ashes, and more rarely outside on the side of the urn. It has been suggested that the top of the urn with its cover would have stood about the ground level, making each individual grave visible (Vicze 1992:94). In addition, the increased elaboration of the procedure through which the urns were closed suggests that the practice of closing the urn became more important and central to the burial ritual throughout time. As the urn is placed so tightly in a pit, with only the top half visible, the wide funnel-shaped mouth would form the entrance to the grave. The pot itself merges with the pit as the container for the body.

Füzesabony

The pottery is the most recurrent component of the inhumation graves of the Füzesabony Culture, and it often appears in sets of three, composed of a cup, a jug and bowl (other types are rare). There are variations in whether the whole set or only particular types are present. Sets as well as individual types may also appear in duplicates, and some graves contain as many as nine or ten vessels (Gelej and Streda nad Bodrogom; Kemenczei 1979; Polla 1960). Sets of pottery are found on most cemeteries, but their specific composition may vary slightly. In the cemetery of Megyaszó, for example, Schalk (1994:156–157) found that large jugs are the standard item of the set; they may be found in combination with just one cup, or one or more cups and a bowl. In the cemetery of Streda nad Bodrogom the most important part of the pottery set was clearly the bowl. Only nine graves were found without one, jugs were missing in 19 graves and cups in 23 graves. The opposite is true for the cemetery of Gelej, where 55 graves contained no cups, but 79 graves were found without a jug and 88 graves without a bowl (Fig. 7).
The ceramics are placed around the head, in front of the hip or next to the legs. At first glance, this does not seem to be very surprising, since these are the available spaces when placing a crouched inhumation into a rectangular or oval pit; however, there are small variations between cemeteries, not only in the composition of the pottery, but also in its placing. In Tiszafüred-Majoroshalom, a cemetery including 635 Füzesabony graves, cups and jugs were most often found beside the head and hips, and larger bowls were placed at the feet (Csányi 2003:157). In Megyaszó, pottery is more often associated with the lower and front part of the body than the head or the back; bronze finds, ornaments and weapons tend to be placed around the head and upper body (Schalk 1994:156). In the cemetery of Gelej, pottery is also found next to the feet, but is also associated with the arms and hands. In a number of graves the body is arranged so that the cups or jugs are found directly at the mouth, as if the deceased was drinking (Fig. 8). This pattern has been confirmed by the recent excavation of the cemetery of Mezőzombor (Koós 2006:80), where in four out of ten sufficiently preserved graves small cups were found in front of the face, apparently placed in the hands of the deceased. There is a strong suggestion of ‘feeding the dead’, which makes it interesting that bowls are not found in front of the face; most are found at the feet, and if not there, at the waist or behind the buttocks. Animal bones were discovered amongst the pottery in some graves (Kovács 1992a:97), which underlines the importance of the pots as containers for food and drink. This may suggest that individual vessel types in the sets were associated with distinct functions and that this was expressed by their placing in relationship to the body in the grave.

Certain associations with pottery were probably shared by all three cultures (for instance pottery as containers for food and drink), but each culture has a distinct way in which these associations are played out in the mortuary arena. In the Encrusted Ware Culture the large quantity of pottery might reflect a whole household repertoire, or pottery from households of the wider community. It is used to

| Streda nad Bodrogom (total number of graves 63, average number of vessels per grave 2.6) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 grave with 4 bowls             | 1 grave with 4 cups              |
| 1 grave with 3 bowls             | 1 grave with 3 jugs              |
| 3 graves with 2 bowls            | 5 graves with 2 cups             |
| 49 graves with 1 bowl            | 39 graves with 1 jug             |
| 9 graves with no bowls           | 19 graves with no jug            |

Gelej (total number of graves 147, average number of vessels per grave 2.0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 grave with 3 bowls</td>
<td>1 grave with 4 cups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 graves with 2 bowls</td>
<td>15 graves with 2 jugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 graves with 1 bowl</td>
<td>51 graves with 1 jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 graves with no bowls</td>
<td>79 graves with no jug</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. The number of particular vessel types per grave in the cemeteries of Streda nad Bodrogom and Gelej.
define and line the body as well as shield it. Arguably, the vessels used as urns in the Vatya Culture in some ways equate with people and may represent individuals. The tight closure meets the need to give the body new boundaries and a contained space in response to the uncertainty over what substance the cremated bones represent. In the Füzesabony Culture, a comparatively standardized set of vessels is required to accompany the body in death. The different types (bowls, jugs and cups) might be designed to function in different ways and seem to be associated with different regions of the body. These differences are striking, as they seem to articulate distinctly different links between the body and the pottery (Figs 9 and 10).

CONCLUSION

In the foregoing analysis we have utilized the ‘snapshot’ that a part of the Middle Bronze Age provides to interpret differences in burial practices. These developed from previous burial traditions and are part of a trajectory of transformation, but the larger picture of change in burial practices over the longer term has not been our concern here. Rather, zooming in on a particular ‘moment’ during the Bronze Age, we have been able to trace differences between groups that lived in close proximity and engaged with each other regularly.

On one level, it becomes clear that the differences between cremation and inhumation did not cause the different communities to alter their basic attitudes to the need to bury the dead in a formal manner. For instance, they all use extra-mural

Figure 8. Left: the association of different pottery types (bowls, jugs, cups) with zones of the body (face, hands, waist, legs, feet, buttocks, and back) in the cemetery of Gelej. Right: an example of the ‘feeding of the dead’ with one hand holding the cup close to the mouth from the same cemetery (grave 26, Kemenczei 1979:fig. 5).
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cemeteries close to the settlements, and they continue to use individual graves. There is no evidence to suggest that either inhumation or cremation was used preferentially for a particular fraction of society.

On another level, there are also discrete variations and regionally specific practices. The inhumation graves of the Füzesabony Culture are similar to many other contemporary Bronze Age traditions in the construction of the graves and the treatment of the body; we can express this by saying that there is not an entirely new ‘language’ developed, even if there may be a distinct ‘dialect’. The reflection on the body during the Füzesabony funerals focuses on its social identity, whereas its corporeal existence is not disputed or altered. The emphasis on social identity does not appear as an explicit central point of the burials of the Encrusted Ware Culture or the Vatya Culture, and the existence of the body appears to be a very real concern. Cremation transforms the body into a substance that requires further attention and assistance. Through burning, the body becomes ‘vulnerable’, and its transformed form calls for discursive engagement to reach an understanding of the new substance. In the two examples of a cremation tradition we see very different responses to these challenges, but, interestingly, both communities seem to draw upon analogies with their domestic environment and routine practices. These differences may be characterized by seeing the Encrusted Ware Culture as reconstituting the body as a ‘two-dimensional’ spatial entity that is laid down and spread out. Hence, despite its fragmentation, the cremated body still echoes the familiar form of the presentation of the fleshy body, as exemplified by the Füzesabony Culture. In contrast, the Vatya urn defines new bodily boundaries within a three-dimensional space. This space can be seen as analogous to the domestic pits with their connotation of storing and preserving, returning us to the notion of the ‘vulnerable’ body.

The way in which bronze ornaments and pottery are differently included in the graves of the three cultures reveals aspects of their relations to the body. Bronze

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encrusted Ware</th>
<th>Vatya</th>
<th>Füzesabony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Encrusted Ware grave" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Vatya urn" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Füzesabony inhumation" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9.** The relationship between pottery and the material body in Middle Bronze Age graves: Encrusted Ware: scattered bones, large amount of pottery over the grave, body-sized; Vatya: enclosed bones, pottery as container, urns in pits; and Füzesabony: inhumation, sets of pottery annotating parts of the body, body-sized grave pits.
dresses elements might have been closely linked to the body itself and thus unintentionally included in the burial, or alternatively they can be added deliberately to the composition to confirm certain elements of social order, such as gender. Pottery may be selected from the domestic assemblages and added to the grave in response to the ‘needs’ of the deceased, and it may simultaneously form part of the construction of the graves themselves, as in the Encrusted Ware and Vatya Cultures.

Whether the body is cremated or inhumed cannot be explained through reference to the everyday practices of each group; but other aspects, such as the use of materials and the forms of the graves do suggest that meaning and metaphors were interchangeable between the spheres of the living and the dead. It is through these links that regional traditions are formed, continued and, most probably, utilized deliberately to articulate and maintain ‘otherness’. The differences become more diffuse in the course of time, and regional distinction in the tradition of burial rites becomes less pronounced, suggesting, perhaps, the fusing of different ideas about the body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cemetery location</strong></th>
<th>Encrusted Ware</th>
<th>Vatya</th>
<th>Füzesabony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>separated from, but in close vicinity to settlements</td>
<td>large and small cemeteries in close vicinity to tells</td>
<td>on elevations next to settlements, separated by small waterways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cemetery size</strong></td>
<td>20–50, rarely over 100 graves none or aligned in lose rows</td>
<td>large cemeteries, some over 1000 graves groups of 9–20 graves or 100–200 graves, in oval arrangements and rows</td>
<td>large cemeteries, hundreds of graves groups of 15–20, irregular shapes, small ovals, rows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial arrangement</strong></td>
<td>oval and rectangular pits, body size and smaller urns</td>
<td>round, very snug pits, urn size</td>
<td>oval and rectangular pits, body size inhumations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grave pits</strong></td>
<td>scattered cremations</td>
<td>few inhumations</td>
<td>few cremations, number increases with time metal frequently present, bodies dressed with ornaments, some other individual bronze goods sets of bowls, jugs and cups, occasionally other vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary burial practice</strong></td>
<td>urn burials also common, particularly in northern region</td>
<td>metal in 5–20% of graves, both cremated with the body and as grave goods, found in and out of urns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other burial practices</strong></td>
<td>metal rare (10% of graves), cremated with the body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bronzes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>metal in 5–20% of graves, both cremated with the body and as grave goods, found in and out of urns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pottery use in graves</strong></td>
<td>large number of vessels (15–25 typical), arranged at the side or on top of cremation, use of fragmented pottery</td>
<td>large vessel used as urn, cover crucial, few additional vessels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 10. Summary table of the funerary characteristics of the Encrusted Ware, Vatya, and Füzesabony Cultures.**
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NOTES

1. As a part of the Leverhulme project ‘Changing beliefs of the Human Body’ based at the University of Cambridge.

2. The data used in this article have been collected through scrutiny of sites published in major Hungarian monographs, monograph series and journals, as well as a few unpublished Vatya cemeteries. Through this, a representative and qualitative insight into cemetery characteristics has been gained.

3. We use the term ‘culture’ in order to connect with the existing research tradition and literature. We do not use the term to imply cultures in the sense of people, we simply use it to refer to groupings of material assemblages and practices that were used by local communities.

4. Other names of the culture include Pannonian Ceramic or Transdanubian Ceramic. In German it is referred to as ‘Kultur der inkrustierten Keramik’ and classified as Early Bronze Age.

5. Childe’s name for the culture was ‘Lovasberény-Vatya-group’ (Childe 1929:278–284), Lovasberény Culture and Vatya Culture were both common names (Bóna 1975:31), but, as early as 1938, Patay stated that he preferred the name Vatya, since the cemetery of Lovasberény is too unhomogeneous to clearly describe a group or archaeological culture (Patay 1938).

6. Although in the Slovakian and Romanian research traditions Füzesabony is called Otoman or Ottomány Culture, and encompasses slightly different areas and timeframes, we use the term as it is commonly used within the Hungarian tradition, concentrating mainly on Hungary and southern Slovakia and excluding what Bóna describes as Gyulavarsánd in eastern Hungary and Romania (Bóna 1975:120; Kalicz 1968:181).

7. The cemetery was excavated in 1985.

8. For example, graves 26, 68, 116, 122, 136, 227 (Kemenczei 1979).
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Paysages du corps: sépultures de l’âge du bronze moyen en Hongrie
Marie Louise Stig Sørensen et Katharina Rebay

L’âge du bronze moyen hongrois nous fournit une occasion d’examiner les « paysages du corps » préhistoriques, puisque la perception et l’attitude envers le corps influencent les pratiques funéraires et autres coutumes relatives au corps comme le port de vêtements et l’utilisation de poterie. Nous examinons dans cet article la diversité culturelle représentée par des groupes avoisinants et à peu près contemporains, à savoir les cultures à Ceramique Incrustée, de Vatya et de Füzesabony. Les différences entre ces trois groupes s’expriment entre autres à travers leurs sépultures (crémations éparpillées, sépultures à urne de même que sépultures en position accroupie) et l’usage divers de la culture matérielle. En même temps, et malgré des différences formelles entre les sépultures, l’analyse montre que les crémations ainsi que les inhumations dans cette région ont un nombre de caractéristiques en commun, et que les pratiques de manipulation des corps des défunts sont le moyen primaire d’exprimer les particularités régionales. Simultanément, les pratiques funéraires comme moyen de formuler les conceptions du corps mort, sont également liées à des différences subtiles du mode de vie, des routines journalières et des stratégies de subsistance régionales, puisque les paysages du vivant fournissent métaphores, savoir-faire et compréhension pratique.

Mots clés: corps, âge du bronze, sépultures, crémation, poterie incrustée, Füzesabony, Hongrie, inhumation, Vatya

Körperlandschaften: Mittelbronzezeitliche Bestattungen in Ungarn
Marie Louise Stig Sørensen und Katharina Rebay


Schlüsselbegriffe: Bestattung, Brandbestattung, Bronzezeit, Füzesabony, Inkrustierte Keramik, Körper, Körperbestattung, Ungarn, Vatya